

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-15, 18, 20-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerson et al. (hereinafter "Gerson") U.S. Patent No. 4,870,686 in view of Ammicht et al. (hereinafter "Ammicht") U.S. Patent No. 6,246,986. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Gerson and Ammicht, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a method of recognizing speech in systems that accept speech input, comprising, at least:

immediately feeding back the recognition result for verification by the user, wherein the recognition result is interrupted by the user prior to being fed back for verification

as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner admits that "Gerson does not teach the use of a barge-in feature that allows the user to interrupt a recognition result before it is completely fed back to the user". Yet, the Examiner attempts to overcome the noted deficiency of Gerson by arguing that Ammicht teaches the interruption of the recognition result prior to being fed back for verification. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Column 3, lines 34-46, and etc., of Ammicht discloses:

FIG. 3 illustrates one implementation of a barge-in arrangement that is designed to help facilitate user-machine interactions in interactive voice response systems (VRUs). The purpose of such an arrangement is twofold. First, the barge-in arrangement allows a machine to ascertain, while it is playing a prompt, whether it is being interrupted by a user uttering meaningful speech, as opposed to simply by noises or language not meant to be heard and used by the machine. Second, the barge-in arrangement distinguishes between a speaker who is merely pausing to think, and a speaker who is done speaking.

Although Ammicht may disclose a barge-in operation so as to determine whether the system receives an utterance that is intended to be interrupted or is merely noise, it is respectfully submitted that the barge-in feature is not performed during the recognition result of the feedback. Ammicht discloses the barge-in operation is performed during a prompt period, rather than during the recognition result period. Accordingly, Ammicht fails to disclose that the recognition result is interrupted by the user prior to being fed back for verification, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are allowable over the prior art. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 13, Applicants submit for similar reasons stated above with regard to claim 1, that claim 13 and those claims dependent thereon are also allowable over the prior art. Withdrawal of this rejection is also respectfully requested.

Claim 6, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerson in view of Ammicht, and further in view of Hou et al. (hereinafter "Hou"), U.S. Patent No. 5,325,421; claim 7-8 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerson in view of Ammicht, and further in view of Vanbuskirk, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,155; claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerson in view of Ammicht, and further in view of Larsen ("Investigating a Mixed-Initiative Dialogue Management Strategy," 1997); and claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerson in view of Ammicht, and further in view of Ladd et al. (hereinafter "Ladd"), U.S. Patent No. 6,269,336. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Gerson and Ammicht neither discloses nor suggests the features recited in claims 1 and 13, the independent claim from which the rejected claims depend. Further, Hou, Vanbuskirk, Larsen and Ladd fail to overcome the noted deficiencies of Gerson in view of Ammicht. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of each of claims 1-27 is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: 

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
703-668-8000

GDY/MJL/DJC/cm